

Remarks

Favorable action on the above-identified patent application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 12, 15-17, 19-21 and 24-26 are amended herein to further clarify the invention, claim 23 is cancelled herein, former dependent claims 5 and 15 are re-presented as independent claims 27 and 28, respectively, and new claim 29 is presented herein. Claims 2, 5-7, 9 and 14 remain unchanged from the originally filed claims, claim 3 remains as previously amended, and claim 22 remains as previously added. Claims 4, 8, 10, 11, 13 and 18 have been previously cancelled. Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, 12, 14-17, 19-22, and 24-29 are currently pending in the application. Of the claims, only claims 1, 7, 12, 17, 27 and 28 are independent. No new subject matter has been added to the application.


The specification is amended herein at paragraph [0019] to correct a typographical error. The word "a" appearing before "another" is deleted, the deleted text being shown in double brackets for clarity. This change to the specification is of a typographical nature and it is submitted that no new matter has been added.

The Examiner has objected to claims 16, 17, 19, 20 and 21 because of informalities as set forth in the Office Action. Applicant has amended such claims to overcome the informalities raised by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the objection to these claims be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 17, 19 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, on the basis that claim 17 recites the limitation "the support member" for which there is insufficient antecedent basis. Claim 17 is amended to removed reference to the limitation "the support member", and accordingly, it is submitted that claim 17, and claims 19 and 20 which

depend from claim 17, now conform to 25 U.S.C. 112. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 12, 14, 17, 19, 20, 22-24 and 26 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,927,108 to Pierce. Reconsideration and withdrawal of such rejections are respectfully requested in view of the amended claims and for the following reasons.

Pierce discloses a wheel lock that includes two opposing hook members 12. Pierce's wheel lock is configured for locking tires of trailers, ATV's and the like, but cannot function to securely engage an equipment component such as a laptop computer like the security device of the present invention. 

Turning first to independent claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom, with reference to the example embodiment shown in Figure 1 of the present application for explanatory purposes only, amended independent claim 1 is directed towards a security device having first and second securing members 12, 14, that have a first and second restraining member 16, 18, respectively. With reference to restraining member 16, each restraining member includes a first pair 42, 44 of spaced apart opposed engagement members, and a further engagement member 32 in spaced opposition to at least one of the opposed engagement members 42, 44. A joining member 36 joins the further engagement member 32 to at least one of the opposed engagement members 42, 44. Such a configuration is neither shown in nor suggested by Pierce, and allows the security device to be used to secure an open lap-top computer as shown in Figure 3, for example. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 and the claims that depend therefrom are directed to novel subject matter that is not anticipated by or made obvious by Pierce or any of the other cited references.

Turning now to independent claim 12 and the claims which depend therefrom, in another example embodiment, the invention is directed towards a security device that can be used to secure either an open or a closed lap-top computer. The security device of claim 12 has first and second securing members that have opposed first and second restraining members. The first and second restraining members each include restraining means having means for engaging first and second opposite facing sides of the cover and first and second opposite facing sides of the base of an open lap-top computer, and means for engaging, on four sides, diagonally located corners of a closed lap-top computer. Such a configuration allows the security device of claim 12 to be used to restrain both open and closed lap-top computers, as shown in Figures 3, 4 and 6,7, for example, and is neither shown in nor suggested by Pierce. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 12 and the claims that depend therefrom are directed to novel subject matter that is not anticipated by or made obvious by Pierce or any of the other cited references. 1c

Turning now to independent claim 17 and the claims which depend therefrom, as amended such claims are directed towards a security device for securing a lap-top computer, and includes telescopically connected first and second securing members. Each securing member includes (i) a U-shaped member defining an opening for receiving a portion of the lap top cover when in the open position (see 42,40,44 of Figure 1; 212 of Figure 5; or 272 of Figure 8, for example); (ii) a rigid base spaced apart from the U-shaped member for extending under a portion of the lap top base member (see 32 of Figure 1; 30 of Figure 5; or 262 of Figure 8, for example), and (iii) a joining member joining the rigid base member and the U-shaped member (see 36,38 of Figure 1; 204,206 of Figure 5; or 266 of Figure 8, for example). Such a configuration is neither shown in nor suggested by Pierce, and allows the security device to be used to secure an open lap-top computer as shown in Figures 3 and 7, for example. Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 17 and the claims that depend therefrom are directed to novel subject matter that is not anticipated by or made obvious by Pierce or any of the other cited references.

For the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has rejected dependent claim 3 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,927,108 to Pierce in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,138,483 to Galant, and has rejected dependent claims 6, 16 and 21 as being rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,927,108 to Pierce in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,467,315 to Edmondson. It is submitted that such claims and the claims from which they depend are patentable over the cited references for the reasons stated above. It is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 5, 7, 9, 15 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In this regard, claims 5 and 15 have each been re-presented, including all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, as claims 27 and 28, respectively. It is further noted that claim 7 was filed and examined as an independent claim, and accordingly is it assumed that the Examiner's intention was to indicate that claims 7 and 9 (which depends from claim 7) are allowed, rather than objected to.

A typographical error has been corrected in claim 15 as indicated in the attached claim amendments.

New dependent claim 29 has been added to further clarify the scope of the invention. Such claim depends from claim 7, and adds limitations similar to those found in existing claims 2 and 3, and is supported by the applications as originally filed, as are all the present claims.

Serial No.: 10/090,272

Attorney Docket No.: 35683.0008


In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that a full and complete response to the Office Action has been made. The claims, as amended herein, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

A check in the amount of \$102.00 is enclosed for payment of additional claim fees for newly added independent claims 27 and 28. If any other fees are occasioned by this Amendment, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge them to, or to credit, Deposit Account 08-2442 of the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
HODGSON RUSS LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

Date: August 12, 2003

HODGSON RUSS LLP
One M&T Plaza
Suite 2000
Buffalo, New York 14203-2391
Tel: (716) 856-4000

By: 
Rachel S. Watt
Reg. No. 46,186